CORRECTIONS STANDARDS AUTHORITY



RFP WORKSHOP

Legislative Requirements

- Competitive grants awarded by CSA
- Consistent with "intent and purpose" of SB 1485

Priority Consideration – MIOCR II counties

Executive Steering Committee Process

Better decisions via reliance on SMEs

- Recommendations on RFP content/design
 - Funding cap & grant period
 - Eligibility & other requirements
 - Rating criteria

- Eligible Applicants
 - All 58 Counties
 - Lead agencies:
 - Adult → Sheriff's Departments and Department of Correction(s)
 - Juvenile —— Probation Departments
 - Designation of local entity as implementing agency

- Eligible Projects
 - Anchored in evidence-based models
 - Examples of Best Practices:

Adults	Juveniles
•ACT/FACT	•MST
•FICM	•FFT
•MTC	•MTFC

- Target Population
 - Definition of Mental Illness
 - Eligibility
 - Offender's status as of July 1, 2006
 - New charge or parole violation
 - Adults Booked into jail
 - Juveniles Detention or Delinquency petition filing

- Coordinated Planning Process
 - Minimum requirements
- Local Match
 - 25% of requested grant amount
- Board of Supervisors' Resolution
 - Attachment D

Using the Rating Criteria

- Six factors for all applicants; seven for MIOCR II
- Application "mirrors" all but one factor (overall proposal quality)
- Equally weighted factors (50 possible points)
- Be responsive!

Rating Factor: Statement of Need

- Impact of MIOs on justice system (support with data!)
- In-custody and/or post-custody treatment and support service gaps
- Existing resources (federal, state and local)

Rating Factor: Project Design

- Evidence-based foundation (can include promising strategies)
- Specifics about services
- Specifics about target population

Rating Factor: Interagency Collaboration

- Legislature recognized importance
- Research confirms value
- Mandatory participants planning process
- Ongoing and past collaboration

Rating Factor: Probability of Success

 EMB: Efficacy with target population (i.e., research results)

Management capacity: "Track Record"

Timeline: Be realistic!

Rating Factors

- Project Budget
- Overall Proposal Quality
 - More not necessarily better!
 - SMEs are human!
- Priority Consideration
 - Adult proposals → MIOCR II
 - 1 to 15 points
 - Response to funding reduction

Building, Justifying and Changing a Budget

- Project Design → Proposed Budget
- Eligible and ineligible costs
- Match sources and types
- Reasonable and appropriate
- Budget modifications for grantees

Understanding the Proposal Evaluation Process

- Technical Compliance: CSA Staff
 - Use form as pre-submission "checklist"
 - Goal: 100% pass rate (but...)
 - "Tiny window " for non-substantive corrections

Understanding the Proposal Evaluation Process

- Merit Review: ESC members
 - Two six-member panels (unless...)
 - 12 perspectives in application of criteria
 - Goal: Reliable, valid and fair process
 - Rater training
 - Scoring program & process
 - Funding recommendations to CSA board

Formatting & Submitting the Grant Application

- Double-spaced, minimum 12-point font
- 30 page limitation
 - MIOCR II grantees → additional 5 pages
- Proposals due November 6, 2006
 - One original and six copies
 - Postmarked by due date
 - Hand-delivered to CSA by 5pm on due date

Fulfilling the Grant Award Requirements

- Data Collection
 - Monthly reporting (?)
 - "High Impact" outcome measures
 - Collaboration with grantees
- Semi-Annual Progress Reports
- Quarterly Invoicing
 - Maintenance of supporting documentation
- On-site Monitoring Visits

Please contact:

 Lynda Frost, Field Representative (916) 445-4099
Lynda.Frost@cdcr.ca.gov

• Helene Zentner, Consultant (916) 323-8631

Helene.Zentner@cdcr.ca.gov

